

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO**

LEIDA PAGAN-TORRES,
Plaintiff

v.

CIVIL NO. 02-1050(DRD)

PUERTO RICO LAND AUTHORITY,
et als.,
Defendants

MOTION	ORDER
Date Filed: 02/18/05 Docket #77 <input type="checkbox"/> Plaintiff <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant Title: Motion to Dismiss Under Rule 38 for Lack of Compliance With Court Order	MOOT. See rulings for Docket Entry Nos. 79 and 81.
Date Filed: 03/08/05 Docket #83 <input type="checkbox"/> Plaintiff <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant Title: Motion for Leave to Reply to Plaintiffs Response to Defendants Motion to Dismiss	MOOT. See rulings for Docket Entry Nos. 79 and 81.
Date Filed: 03/14/05 Docket #84 <input type="checkbox"/> Plaintiff <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant Title: Motion Requesting that Motion for Summary Judgment be Granted as Unopposed	GRANTED in part. Ace Insurance Co.'s motion for summary judgment is deemed unopposed. However, motions for summary judgment shall be granted only if the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law and not because the dispositive motion remains unopposed. Rule 56(c), Fed.R.Civ.P.

<p>Date Filed: 03/29/05 Docket #87 <input type="checkbox"/> Plaintiff <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant Title: Motion Requesting Extension of Time to Respond to ACE Insurance's Motion Requesting that Motion for Summary Judgment be Granted as Unopposed</p>	<p>MOOT. The deadline self-imposed by defendants have already elapsed without oppositions to Ace Insurance Co.'s motion for summary judgment having been filed within said deadline. Further, at the Status Conference held on October 5, 2004, the Court reminded the parties that having too many cases to handle is not an excuse to fail to comply with this Court's Order. The Court, consistently, has refused to accept such excuses. See. <u>Méndez v. Banco Popular de P.R.</u>, 900 F.2d 4,8 (1st Cir. 1990); <u>Pinero Schroeder v. FNMA</u>, 574 F.2d 1117,1118 (1st Cir. 1978). "The fact that an attorney has other fish to fry is not an acceptable reason for disregarding a court order". <u>Chamorro v. Puerto Rican Cars INC</u>, 304, F.3d 1, 5 (1st Cir., 2002). This mandate to the undersigned means: "Too many fish to fry is no excuse to fail to comply". Precisely, counsel's failure to comply fall within the doctrine set forth in <u>Chamorro</u> which is not an excuse to fail to comply.</p>
--	--

IT IS SO ORDERED.

In San Juan, Puerto Rico, this 24th day of April 2005.

S/DANIEL R. DOMINGUEZ
DANIEL R. DOMINGUEZ
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE